

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-4 and 6-11 are now present in the application. Claims 1, 4, 7 and 9 have been amended. Claim 5 has been cancelled. Claim 1 is independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been addressed. Accordingly, claim 4 is now definite and clear. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are therefore respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 & 103

Claims 1-5, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Nagasaki, U.S. Patent No. 4,792,139. Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Nagasaki. Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagasaki in view of Hutin, U.S. Patent No. 5,586,947. Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagasaki in view of Nakanishi, U.S. Patent No. 4,928,972. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In light of the foregoing amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that these rejections have been obviated and/or rendered moot. As the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements including “the reinforcing layer integrally forming a perimeter rearward extension, the perimeter rearward extension extending rearward along an inner surface of the perimeter wall, the perimeter rearward extension being tightly bonded to the entire inner surface of the perimeter wall so as to insure bond attachment of the reinforcing layer to the back of the striking plate while striking the golf ball”. Applicant respectfully submits that the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1 is not disclosed nor suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

Nagasaki teaches a golf club head with an FRP plate 4 attached to the rear side of the metal layer 6 (see FIGs. 5 and 9). However, the FRP plate 4 does not have any portion extending rearward along an inner surface of the upper and lower edges 1a/10a and 1b/10b nor be tightly bonded to the entire inner surface of the upper and lower edges 1a/10a

and 1b/10b. The FRP plate 4 of Nagasaki is merely bonded to a tiny portion of the upper and lower edges 1a/10a and 1b/10b (see FIGs. 5 and 9). Therefore, Nagasaki fails to teach the above combination of elements as recited in claim 1.

With regard to the Examiner's reliance on Hutin and Nakanishi, these references have only been relied on for their teachings related to the subject matter of dependent claims 6 and 9. These references also fail to disclose the above combination of elements as set forth in amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, these references fail to cure the deficiencies of Nagasaki.

Accordingly, none of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teach or suggest the limitations of amended independent claim 1 or its dependent claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims clearly define over the teachings of the references relied on by the Examiner.

In particular, dependent claim 7 recites "the perimeter rearward extension includes a plurality of notches and engaging teeth arranged in a staggered manner, the engaging teeth being engaged with a flange of the perimeter wall of the golf club head body, the notches permitting a portion of the inner surface of the perimeter wall being exposed in the notches of the perimeter rearward extension". Although the Examiner alleged that Applicant admitted that the above recitation has no

mechanical function, Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant in paragraph beginning on page 9, line 9 of the specification and FIGs. 12 and 13 discloses the above recitation. Applicant also discloses that by not covering the material 152 on the areas 153, the amount of material can be reduced without adversely affecting the structural strength, the vibration absorption, and the support. Therefore, Applicant in the specification does disclose the function of the above recitation in claim 7. Applicant respectfully submits none of the references utilized by the Examiner individually or in combination teach or suggest the above recitation of claim 7.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but merely to show the state of the prior art, no further comments are necessary with respect thereto.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.


In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe McKinney Muncy, Registration No. 32,334 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By


Joe McKinney Muncy
Reg. No. 32,334

KM/GH/mmi
3624-0136P

P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000